



FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

“keeping people informed”

Dear Members,

This mail is my response to the PSZ paper provided by Richard Ward of RBC..

I ask the committee to consider the following extracts from the attached Rushmoor consultation response and the CAA’s Consultation Response Document (CRD):

Response from Rushmoor to the CAA’s Consultation.

A key extract is Rushmoor’s request for assurance that “ *the extent of the proposed PSZ will properly address the risk posed to the borough’s residents that live on the flight path to the airport, specifically as the proposal will enable densification of residential development within areas that currently lie within the existing PSZ area.* ”

According to the Rushmoor PSZ paper, the status of the revised PSZ “*will in no way impinge on the status of the 1;100,000 per annum annual individual risk contour defined under the current planning permission.* ”

This individual risk contour was derived using a model that the CAA now deems to be “*out of date*” and “*no longer fit for purpose*” (see CAA’s response to Luton Borough Council).

Questions Arising

The questions arising for Rushmoor and FAL are:

1. How does the model used by FAL to demonstrate that Rushmoor’s annual individual risk contour has not been exceeded, differ from the model deemed by the CAA as ‘no longer fit for purpose’?
2. Has the necessary use of an alternative model refreshed the Rushmoor contours, and if so, do the resulting contours continue to extend beyond the outer boundaries of the new fixed PSZs? If this modelling has not been undertaken, then why not?
3. Has Rushmoor been advised that it would be in breach of PSZ guidance should it continue to apply land use constraints in areas beyond the new fixed PSZs but within its retained 1 in 100,000 contours?

Response from FAL to the CAA’s Consultation.

FAL’s response to the Consultation is comment number 13 in the attached CRD. It says:

“ Farnborough Airport welcomes this long-awaited review on how PSZ s are established at airports with refence to the removal of the review period and the operational and financial resources associated.

As one of the few airports in the UK that have related operational restrictions we see these proposals, which are put forward as a direct result of changes in aviation safety, as a positive step forward with regard to any future planning obligations.”

This response makes it clear that FAL see Local Plan policies and current permissions as an unnecessary constraint on growth. The key question for FAL is whether it would appeal to the Secretary of state should Rushmoor, in complying with its Local Plan policies, reject a future planning application for growth on third party risk grounds.

Transparency

Being a safety related matter, a lack of transparency is an issue. I attach for member's information the DfT's rejection of a Freedom of Information(FOI) request for sight of the legal advice the DfT received prior to its support for the revised PSZ policy.

I also note that, at the time of this submission, the CAA's response to Rushmoor's request for advice has not been released into the public domain.

Kind regards

Geoff Marks.
June 2022.



Response for Fol ID
F0021078.docx



Rushmoor PSZ
Consultation Responson



20220225Consultati
response documer